



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,384	02/12/2002	Edy S. Liongsari	33836000018	5564
33391	7590	09/28/2004	EXAMINER	
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE ONE INDIANA SQUARE, SUITE 1600 INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204			RICHER, AARON M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2676	

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/074,384	LIONGOSARI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Aaron M Richer	2676	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 and 24-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12 and 24-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 February 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All
  - b) Some \*
  - c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20040618, 20040823.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION*****Information Disclosure Statement***

1. In an interview with Sanders Hillis on September 2, 2004, a correction to the Information Disclosure Statement filed June 18, 2004 was disclosed.

---

Reference C19 was not cited correctly. The corrected reference has been placed on PTO-892 form attached to this Office Action. A copy of the reference was not furnished with this Office Action, because the reference was not cited by the examiner.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed June 18, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As to claims 1, 12, and 24, the applicant argues that the objects and subheadings disclosed by Gentile do not read on regions and indicia as described in claim 1. It is noted that the subheadings, although they are objects, are "distinctive marks" or "indications" pointing out what content is displayed in nearby regions of the page, thus meeting the definition of indicia. The applicant further argues that the objects disclosed by Gentile are not displayed on a display. It is noted that figure 2 is defined as a page or page representation (col. 5, lines 1-10). Regardless of whether the page or page representation is displayed on a monitor or printed on a printer, it is still a display. The applicant further argues that the data objects of Gentile do not correspond to data indicia, and that even if they did, they would not be representing data elements. The examiner respectfully disagrees with this assertion. Some of the data objects

disclosed by Gentile (the "Text", "Graphics" labels) do correspond to data indicia, since the definition of indicia is so broad as to include any indications of what is contained on the various regions of the page. These labels are representing the different regions of the page, much as a street sign would be an indicium or representation of a road being driven upon.

As to claims 2 and 3, the applicant argues that figure 6 and figure 8 of Kirk represent two different browsers, and so the edges of figure 6 cannot comprise the edges of figure 8. It is noted that the examiner never suggested a relation of this sort between figures 6 and 8. It was stated in the rejection to claim 2 that figures 6-8 show a plurality of relationships, and further in claim 3 that figure 8 shows confirmed relationships. Claim 3 recites a "relationship indicium representative of a confirmed relationship between related data elements of the plurality of data elements" and figure 8 clearly shows relationships based on a user's past actions, thus they are confirmed relationships.

As to claims 4, 5, and 26, the applicant argues that Hamaguchi does not teach relationship indicia, nor does Hamaguchi teach an indicium representative of a potential relationship that is converted into a confirmed relationship. It is noted that Hamaguchi describes "linking conditions" specified by an operator for "related image data" (col. 5, lines 36-56). "Retrieval data" is displayed. The fact that this data has been retrieved and displayed is an indication, or indicium, of a potential relationship. When the link data is confirmed by a user, new link information is set up. This new link information reads on indicia representative of

a confirmed relationship, and it has been converted from an earlier potential relationship.

As to claims 8-11 and 28-29, the applicant argues that Lamping fails to teach display of a focus indicium and receipt of selection of a second indicium to be a focus indicium. The applicant further argues that navigation within a display is not equivalent to the selection of an indicium. It is noted that Lamping discloses a "translation between the points the user specifies" and fig. 20 shows a plurality of indicia (nodes) that are becoming closer to or further away from the center of the view, or the focus. Thus, the user, by rotating the view to see different indicia, is selecting indicia to view or move away from, and focusing the view on or away from said indicia.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 12, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gentile (U.S. Patent 5,949,968).

5. As to claims 1, 12, and 24, Gentile discloses a method for displaying data element indicia representative of a plurality of data elements interrelated by a plurality of relationships, wherein the plurality of data elements comprise a

plurality of data types, and each indicium of the data element indicia has a corresponding data type, the method comprising:

displaying region indicia representative of a plurality of regions on the display, wherein each region of the plurality of regions corresponds to one of the plurality of data types (see abstract and fig. 2-fig. 3; the “regions” in the abstract have “region types” corresponding to “data types”; region indicia are shown as elements 38, 42, and 46 in fig. 2);

and displaying the data element indicia according to the plurality of regions, wherein each indicium of the data element indicia is displayed in a region of the plurality of regions according to the corresponding data type (see abstract and fig. 2-fig. 3; the “data objects” in the abstract correspond to data element indicia and are displayed in a region according to “data type”).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2, 3, 25, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gentile in view of Kirk (U.S. Patent 5,768,578).

8. As to claims 2 and 25, Gentile discloses the method of claim 1. Gentile does not disclose a method comprising displaying, relative to the data element indicia, relationship indicia representative of the plurality of relationships. Kirk,

however, discloses the display of relationship indicia representative of a plurality of relationships (see fig. 6-fig. 8; col. 29, lines 20-31; and col. 33, lines 17-28).

The motivation for this is to better organize data (col. 1, lines 62-67 and col. 2, lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Gentile to display relationship indicia in order to better organize data as taught by Kirk.

---

9. As to claim 3, Gentile and Kirk obviate the method of claim 2. Kirk further discloses a method wherein the relationship indicia comprise at least one relationship indicium representative of a confirmed relationship between related data elements of the plurality of data elements (see fig. 8 and col. 33, lines 17-28; a relationship based on path history is a confirmed relationship because it is diagramming a user's past actions).

10. As to claim 30, Gentile discloses the apparatus of claim 24. Gentile does not disclose an apparatus wherein the executable instructions form a part of a browser application stored in the at least one memory device. Kirk, however, discloses a user interface that includes a hypertext browser and a knowledge base browser/editor (see abstract). The motivation for this is so a user can browse an information space, such as the World Wide Web (col. 2, lines 18-26). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Gentile to display information in a browser application in order to enable a user to brows the World Wide Web as taught by Kirk.

11. Claims 4, 5, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gentile in view of Kirk as applied to claims 3 and 25 above, and further in view of Hamaguchi (U.S. Patent 5,276,805).

12. As to claim 4, Gentile and Kirk obviate the method of claim 3 and a relationship indicium representative of a relationship between data elements. Neither Gentile nor Kirk discloses a relationship indicium representative of a *potential* relationship. Hamaguchi, however, discloses a unit that retrieves unconfirmed, and therefore potential, image data (see fig. 3a-fig. 3c and col. 5, lines 37-56). The motivation for this is so that potential relationships can be linked (col. 5, lines 37-56) and related information is successively recorded so that it may be retrieved quickly (col. 2, lines 6-16). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Gentile and Kirk to show potential relationship data in order to have a user confirm that data so that the system may store related data successively as taught by Hamaguchi.

13. As to claims 5 and 26, Gentile, Kirk, and Hamaguchi obviate the method of claim 4. Hamaguchi further discloses receiving, relative to one relationship indicium, an indication confirming a potential relationship, and converting the one relationship indicium to a confirmed relationship (col. 5, lines 37-56; the user's command to link retrieval data found is confirming a potential relationship).

14. Claims 6, 7, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gentile in view of Staab (U.S. Patent 5,499,334).

15. As to claims 6 and 27, Gentile discloses the method of claim 1. Gentile does not disclose a method wherein region indicia define a grid pattern. Staab, however, discloses a method of displaying information in regions using a grid pattern (see fig. 6-fig. 16). The motivation for using this grid pattern is to display many different desktop configurations in different regions at once to allow a user

to select a desktop (col. 2, lines 3-35). It would have been obvious to modify Gentile to display region indicia in a grid pattern in order to display many regions at once as taught by Staab.

16. As to claim 7, Gentile in view of Staab obviates the method of claim 6.

---

Staab further discloses a method wherein region indicia define a 3x3 grid pattern (see fig. 6-fig. 16).

17. Claims 8-11 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gentile in view of Lamping (U.S. Patent 5,619,632).

18. As to claims 8 and 28, Gentile discloses the method of claim 1. Gentile does not disclose displaying a first indicium as a focus indicium, wherein the region indicia are based on the first indicium, nor does Gentile disclose displaying relationship indicia representative of the plurality of relationships relative to the first indicium. Lamping, however, discloses using a focus to display a first indicium (see fig. 14-fig. 21; col. 24, lines 66-67; and col. 25, lines 1-37; the figures show a focus on a first node or indicium in the center and relationships to other nodes indicated by edges). The motivation for this focus is so that a user can find out about the context of a node of interest (col. 3, lines 8-18). It would have been obvious to modify Gentile to include a focus indicium in order to show a particular node in context as taught by Lamping.

19. As to claim 9, Gentile in view of Lamping obviates the method of claim 8. Lamping further discloses displaying a first indicium in a central region (see fig. 14; element 556 is the focus and is displayed in a central region)

20. As to claims 10 and 29, Gentile in view of Lamping obviates the method of claim 8. Lamping further discloses

receiving a selection indication representative of selection of a second indicium as the focus indicium (see fig. 20 and col. 27, lines 10-22; the user's manipulations are of the view can select a second indicium);

displaying the region indicia based on the second indicium (see fig. 20; this shows the focus being changed in response to user manipulations);

and displaying the relationship indicia relative to the second indicium (see fig. 20; lines represent relationships).

21. As to claim 11, Gentile in view of Lamping obviates the method of claim 10. Lamping further discloses displaying the second indicium in a central region (see fig. 20 and col. 26, lines 16-29; this shows the transition of focus from one node to another).

### ***Conclusion***

22. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron M Richer whose telephone number is (703) 305-5825. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Bella can be reached on (703) 308-6829. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



AMR  
9/22/04

MATTHEW C. BELLA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600